

THE *DIALOGUE OF ADAMANTIUS*: PREPARING THE CRITICAL EDITION AND A REAPPRAISAL¹

Abstract: The *Dialogue of Adamantius* raises many philological and literary issues concerning its author, its date of composition, its double redaction, and its relations to Origen, a “Maximus”, Eusebius, Methodius, the Philocalists, and Rufinus. A systematic study of it is a substantial desideratum. Contrary to what has often been maintained, Adamantius’ doctrines, his way of arguing, his Scriptural quotations and exegesis, and many other points correspond to Origen’s authentic ideas and methodologies. Hence the identification of Adamantius with Origen supported by the Cappadocians and Rufinus, who read the original Greek. The present essay does not suggest that Origen himself wrote the *Dialogue*; this may have been composed on the basis of Origen’s dialogues and, at any rate, of his ideas.

Assessing the reliability of Rufinus’ translation is crucial from both the literary and even the doctrinal viewpoint, since Rufinus’ Latin includes passages on universal restoration or ἀποκατάστασις that are absent from the extant Greek. I shall argue for the anteriority of Rufinus’ version to the extant Greek on the basis of many philological points and arguments from content, and point out parallels with another late-antique text translated by Rufinus, and other late antique parallels (also within the complex interplay of translations, not only from Greek into Latin, but also from Latin into Greek).

Keywords: Origen, Adamantius, “Maximus”, Eusebius of Caesarea, Methodius, the Philocalists, Rufinus of Aquileia, ἀποκατάστασις, athetesis, Byzantinisms, Greek and Latin redactions, Latin translations into Greek, *Historia monachorum*, versions of the Chalcedon Council, *Sentences of Sextus*

The *Dialogue of Adamantius* raises many philological and literary issues related to its author, date, double redaction, and relations to Origen, Eusebius, Methodius, the Philocalists, and Rufinus. Although a Greek and a Latin edition, a partial commentary on the first two books, a translation, and several short studies have

1) I am very grateful to the publics of lectures I gave on this topic at NAPS, Chicago 2012; FIEC, Bordeaux 2014; Oxford University, Classics, 2016, and Cambridge University, 2018, and Durham University, 2019, as well as to the Editors of RhM and the reviewer.

been devoted to this problematic work,² a systematic study of it is still missing, as Richard Hanson pointed out already two decades ago,³ and is being prepared. Two substantial essays have been offered meanwhile, to shed light on this dialogue,⁴ and an Oxford critical edition with a commentary, as well as a systematic monograph, which will offer novel research, are in the works.

As I shall illustrate here briefly in the first part, Adamantius' doctrines, way of arguing, Scriptural quotations and exegesis, and many other points correspond to Origen's authentic ideas and methodologies. Hence the identification of Adamantius with Origen supported by the Cappadocians and Rufinus, who read the original Greek. This does not mean that Origen himself wrote the

2) Edition of the extant Greek: W.H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen, *Der Dialog des Adamantius περὶ τῆς εἰς Θεὸν ὁρθῆς πίστεως*, Leipzig 1901 (GCS 4). Edition of Rufinus' Latin version: V. Buchheit, *Tyrannii Rufini Librorum Adamantii Origenis adversus haereticos interpretatio*, München 1966. Translation: R. A. Pretty, *Dialogue on the True Faith in God: De recta in Deum fide*, Leuven 1997. The (partial) studies will be mostly cited in the course of this article; see also M. Hoffmann, *Der Dialog bei den christlichen Schriftstellern der ersten vier Jahrhunderte*, Berlin 1966 (TU 96), esp. xxxv–xxxviii; briefly Alberto Rigolio, *Christians in Conversation*, Oxford 2019, 92–95, and, for a useful account of the history of research into the *Dialogue*, although with omissions and of course not updated, K. Tsutsui, *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Markioniten im Adamantios-Dialog*, Berlin 2004, 1–21, on Caspari, Zahn, van de Sande Bakhuyzen, Koetschau, von Harnack, Bardenhewer, Quasten, Vinzenz Buchheit, the aforementioned Manfred Hoffmann, Bernd Voss, John Clabeaux, and Ulrich Schmid. The commentary by Tsutsui, cited above in this note, only deals with the first two books, and just with the speeches of Adamantius' opponents, and is only based on the extant Greek (albeit in a better edition than Bakhuyzen's, grounded in codex Venetus Marcianus gr. 496), which, in its present form, is not original: see the second part of this essay.

3) R. P. C. Hanson, *The search for the Christian doctrine of God: the Arian controversy 318–381*, London 1988, ²2005, 827: "The obscure and not properly investigated *Dialogue of Adamantius*."

4) I. Ramelli, *The Dialogue of Adamantius: A Document of Origen's Thought?*, *StPatr* 52 (2012) 71–98; 56 (2013) 227–73; *The Reception of Origen's Thought in Western Theological and Philosophical Traditions*, in: A. Jacobsen (ed.), *Origeniana Undecima*, Leuven 2016, 443–67, and, concisely, *De recta in Deum fide*, in: P. van Geest, B. J. Lietaert Peerbolte, D. Hunter, and A. DiBerardino (eds.), *Brill Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, Leiden forthcoming, online 05 November 2018: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2589-7993_EECO_SIM_036558>; <https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-encyclopedia-of-early-christianity-online/de-recta-in-deum-fide-SIM_036558>; *Dialogue of Adamantius*, in: *Cambridge Dictionary of Later Latin Literature*, Cambridge, forthcoming.

Dialogue, which may have been based on Origen's dialogues and debates, and, more generally, on his ideas.

I. Issues Surrounding the Dialogue

The *Dialogue of Adamantius* was written in Greek, attached to Origen by the Philocalists, and translated into Latin by Rufinus, within his programmatic version of Origen's corpus. Rufinus identified Adamantius (Origen's byname, only used by Christian authors) with Origen, thereby presenting Origen as fully "orthodox", since the "orthodox" viewpoint in the *Dialogue* is represented by Adamantius. Rufinus' version seems to be based on a Greek 'Vorlage' different from the extant Greek and probably closer to the original; I doubt that all discrepancies are necessarily due to Rufinus' voluntary alterations, as it has been repeatedly assumed: I shall return to this point, with the relevant literature, in the second part.

A passage in the *Dialogue* resembles one from Methodius' *De autexusio*, but Eusebius ascribes this excerpt to *On Matter* by a "Maximus" (PE 7.22), who lived much earlier than Methodius, under Commodus and Septimius (HE 5.26.1). Although it is impossible to prove it with certainty, it has been hypothesised with sound reasons that Eusebius' Maximus, the author of the same discussions, and discussion topics, as in the *Dialogue*, may have been Maximus of Tyre, whose ideas on matter, God, evil, and theodicy were known to Origen.⁵ Convergences in names, dates, contents, arguments, procedures of thought, notions, comparisons, similes, and imagery, and revealing linguistic details and quotations point to a connection between Eusebius' Maximus and Maximus of Tyre.

My hypothesis is confirmed by Origen's knowledge of Maximus of Tyre. Already Pépin suggested that the "care or providence" argument⁶ was known to both Maximus and Origen.⁷ In-

5) I. Ramelli, "Maximus" on Evil, Matter, and God: Arguments for the Identification of the Source of Eusebius PE 7.22, *Adamantius* 16 (2010) 230–55.

6) On which see D. Burns, Care or Prayer? Justin Martyr's *Dialogue* with Trypho 1.4 Revisited, *VigChr* 68 (2014) 178–91.

7) J. Pépin, *Prière et providence au 2ème siècle*, in: *Images of Man (Festschrift Verbeke)*, Louvain 1976, 111–25: 123.

deed, Origen's *De oratione* responds precisely to Maximus of Tyre's objections to prayer in Diss. 5, on whether one should pray, 37–45 Trapp.⁸ First Origen summarises these objections (Or. 5.6.2–6 Koetschau): if God foreknows what will happen, and this must happen necessarily, there is no point to pray; if everything happens according to God's will (βούλησις), and God cannot change his decisions (βουλεύματα), there is no point to pray. Then Origen replies to Maximus' objections (Or. 6.4.1–13): the Godhead in its foreknowledge (πρόγνωσις) foresees one's freewill and the prayers one is going to formulate, and in its providence (πρόνοια) arranges everything according to what is reasonable and worthy (κατ' ἀξίαν). It is up to the individual to pray for things "worthy of God", as the Pythagorean Christianised *Sentences of Sextus* (well known to Origen) 122 maintained. The same was recommended by Porphyry, Marc. 24.

Maximus' ideas were known to Origen before Eusebius, who might have drawn Maximus' material from Origen; this would explain the presence of the same material in both Methodius and the *Dialogue*. Although it is generally assumed that the *Dialogue* draws on Methodius,⁹ it is more likely that Methodius depends on the *Dialogue*,¹⁰ whose original Greek redaction seems to have been earlier than Methodius (see below the concluding paragraphs of Section II). Eusebius might have had at his disposal a Christian reworking of Maximus in a dialogue. Maximus may have been imported into the Christian debate by Methodius, or through Origen, who knew and cited Maximus, or a dialogue of Origen. Origen may have known him through his *Dialexeis* or directly, for instance when he was delivering his diatribes in Rome, just when Origen went there, or subsequently, when Origen was in Caesarea and

8) See A. Timotin, *La prière dans la tradition platonicienne, de Platon à Proclus*, Turnhout 2017, Ch. 4, and the remarks in the relevant review, forthcoming in BMCR.

9) E. g. G. Sanders, *Un écrit oublié: le Dialogue d'Adamantius*, *AntClass* 37 (1968) 644–51 deems the *Dialogue* composed by an anonymous author who wrote in Asia Minor around 330, drawing on Methodius; Pretty, *Dialogue* (above, n. 2) 19–20, etc.

10) T. Barnes, *Methodius, Maximus, and Valentinus*, *JTS* 30 (1979) 47–55, against the more common thesis that the *Dialogue* depends on Methodius (see preceding note), rather hypothesised that Methodius depends on the *Dialogue*.

Tyre. This could explain the transmission of the same material in Christian literature both under the name of Maximus, in Eusebius, and under that of Origen in Philocalia 24 – where the authors notice a perfect correspondence between Eusebius' excerpt and a passage in our *Dialogue* – and even neither under Maximus' name nor under Origen's in Methodius' *De autexusio*.

Although such hypotheses must remain speculative, what is more certain is that in the *Dialogue* there is more of Origen's true thought than is commonly assumed: the *Dialogue of Adamantius*, therefore, may be a reworking of Origen's ideas in a dialogic form.

II. Correspondences between the *Dialogue* and Origen's Thought

What Adamantius supports in the *Dialogue* demonstrably corresponds to Origen's authentic thought. Critics, such as Edgar Goodspeed and Robert Pretty,¹¹ used to base their denial of connections between Adamantius and Origen on irreconcilable differences in doctrine, such as that of the resurrection. Arguably, however, such differences result from an inaccurate reconstruction of Origen's ideas. The main correspondences between Adamantius' and Origen's ideas range from the most general to many precise parallels.¹²

For instance, the attitude to Biblical allegoresis is positive in both Origen and Adamantius (808b), like that to Greek philosophy, including a rebuttal of Epicurus – the only critique addressed by Adamantius to a philosophical doctrine, against the representative of the 'atheistic' philosophy that Origen refused to teach.¹³

11) Edgar J. Goodspeed, review of van de Sande Bakhuyzen's edition, *AJTh* 5 (1901) 786–8: 786: "as early as 1685 critics based their denial of any connection of the work with Origen on irreconcilable differences in doctrine – *e. g.*, of the resurrection – between this dialogue and the genuine writings of that father". These irreconcilabilities are stressed by Pretty (above, n. 2) 11–4, in a series of points; these have all been refuted by Ramelli, *The Dialogue of Adamantius* (above, n. 4) 268–73.

12) Cf. Ramelli, *The Dialogue of Adamantius* (above, n. 4).

13) Detailed discussion in my *The Rejection of the Epicurean Ideal of Pleasure in Late Antique Sources: Not Only Misunderstandings*, *Mirabilia* 18 (2014) 6–21; more comprehensively, on atheism and metaphysical issues: *Epicureanism and Early Christianity*, in: Ph. Mitsis (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Epicureanism*, Oxford forthcoming, ch. 24.

The arbiter himself in the *Dialogue* is no Christian, but expression of the philosophical λόγος, which is meant to make his support stronger, impartial, and coming from philosophy. The notion of divine pedagogy expounded by Adamantius (810bc) is also typical of Origen, who insists on it in *Homilies on Jeremiah* and elsewhere. Like Origen, Adamantius uses it to refute the Marcionite claim that the Creator's law is different from Christ's, and contrary to it. Adamantius argues that these are not different laws, but different stages, according to the spiritual development of the people to whom they were given. Adamantius' scriptural citations and arguments here, including the insistence on the passage from fear to love, can be traced back to Origen's.

Adamantius' whole argument against the Marcionite Megethius (814d–815b), based on the unity of God's justice and goodness, is Origen's anti-Marcionite argument (Princ. 3 and elsewhere). It even helps reconstruct Marcion's Gospel, as Dieter Roth has shown.¹⁴ Similarly, Adamantius' argument against the Valentinian "three natures" (821cd) and his recourse to Paul's example (821e) go back to Origen (H. Ier. 1.15–16; Princ. 1.8.2), even with the same words. The difference between humans – both Origen and Adamantius explain – is not in nature, but in freewill. Here, too, Adamantius' reference to Matt 7:18 in an anti-Gnostic interpretation is the same as is found in Origen, Princ. 3.1.18; 1.8.2. Adamantius' anti-Marcionite exegesis of the Dives and Lazarus parable (826e–827c) comes from Origen's interpretation in every detail.

Adamantius' and Origen's approaches to canonicity are the same. Adamantius' insistence on the intention of Jesus of perfecting the Law, not destroying it (832b), is the same as the view of Origen, who insisted on this many times to maintain the unity of Scripture, forming one and the same body – Christ's body. To demonstrate the unity of OT and NT, both Adamantius and Origen support the unity of scriptural interpretation, typological (the OT as a prefiguration of the NT) and allegorical. To legitimate this inter-

14) D. Roth, *The Text of Marcion's Gospel*, Leiden 2015, 347–95. Another source could be the Seneca-Paul pseudepigraphic correspondence, as I suggested in: *A Pseudepigraphon Inside a Pseudepigraphon? The Seneca-Paul Correspondence and the Letters Added Afterwards*, JSPs 23 (2014) 259–89; a systematic investigation is needed and projected.

pretation, both Adamantius (86c–868a) and Origen (Princ. 4.2.6 = Philoc. 1.13) observe that Paul interpreted the OT allegorically (e. g. 1 Cor. 10:1–4).¹⁵ The argumentative strategies are the very same.

Salvation by faith and the Moses-Jesus salvific typology are further elements of convergence between Adamantius and Origen. Revealing are then catchphrases and catchwords such as “There Was a Time When ... Was [Not]” (ἦν ποτε ὅτε [οὐκ] ἦν, 843c) and ὁμοούσιος. The former formula was used by Origen in at least two passages among his writings extant in Greek. I argued extensively that he imported it from philosophical into Christian language – where it became anti-‘Arian’: “there was no time when the Son did not exist”.¹⁶ This formula was absent from Christian literature before Origen, and, apart from Origen, was not deployed until the outbreak of the ‘Arian’ controversy. Adamantius’ profession of faith (804cd) includes the assertion that the Logos is consubstantial (ὁμοούσιος) with the Father – what Origen arguably maintained. Although this is notoriously debated,¹⁷ Origen probably used ὁμοούσιος in reference to the Father-Son relationship; his anti-subordinationism has been argued forcefully to have closely inspired Nysen, who took over his arguments, Scriptural supporting passages and interpretations, and his very words.¹⁸

15) See my *The Role of Allegory, Allegoresis, and Metaphor in Paul and Origen*, JGRCJ 14 (2018) 130–157; Eadem, *Allegory*, in: P. van Geest, B. J. Lietaert Peerbolte, D. Hunter, and A. DiBerardino (eds.), *Brill Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, Leiden, forthcoming; online on 5 Nov. 2018 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2589-7993_EECO_SIM_00000113>; <https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-encyclopedia-of-early-christianity-online/allegory-SIM_00000113>.

16) *Alexander of Aphrodisias: A Source of Origen’s Philosophy?*, *Philosophie Antique* 14 (2014) 237–90, received, e. g., by G. Karamanolis, *Early Christian Philosophers on Aristotle*, in: A. Falcon (ed.), *Brill’s Companion to the Reception of Aristotle*, Leiden 2016, ch. 23; R. Chiaradonna, *Porphyry and the Aristotelian Tradition*, *ibidem*, 321–40: 334–5, 340. Further in the monograph on Origen in preparation.

17) See, e. g., Ch. Bruns, *Trinität und Kosmos: Zur Gotteslehre des Origenes*, Münster 2013.

18) So M. Edwards, *Did Origen Apply the Word Homousios to the Son?*, *JTS* 49 (1998) 658–70; P. F. Beatrice, *The Word Homousios from Hellenism to Christianity*, *Church History* 71 (2002) 243–272; I. Ramelli, *Origen’s Anti-Subordinationism and Its Heritage in the Nicene and Cappadocian Line*, *VigChr* 65 (2011) 21–49; Origen, *Greek Philosophy, and the Birth of the Trinitarian Meaning of Hypostasis*, *HTR* 105 (2012) 302–50; *The Father in the Son, the Son in the*

Remarkable convergences with Origen emerge from Adamantius' debate with the Bardaisanite Marinus, e. g. on evil, the devil, and death. Eutropius' argument (836 f) exactly corresponds to Origen's, that eternal life cannot possibly coexist with eternal death (C. Rom. 5.7). Adamantius defended the resurrection (from 859b) against Marinus' contention that the resurrection of the body will not happen. It is often stated¹⁹ that Adamantius' position does not reflect Origen's true position, but makes it more "orthodox". However, Origen's position was arguably the same as Adamantius': the body, both now and in the resurrection, is constituted by the four elements (and no others, with a refutation of Aristotle's fifth element²⁰); these remain, but qualities will change. Adamantius rests again on the same Biblical quotations and interpretations as Origen's (Gen 46:27 in 802b, like Princ. 4.3.11, etc.)

Adamantius' refutation of Marinus' objection that the body is the cause of evil for the soul corresponds to Origen's conviction that corporeality tout court preceded the fall: it did not follow it.

Father (John 10:38, 14:10, 17:21): Sources and Reception of Dynamic Unity in Middle and Neoplatonism, "Pagan" and Christian, in: Julie Casteigt (ed.), *Die Quellen der Idee der dynamischen Einheit – des reziproken Ineinseins – im Iohannesevangelium*, Leuven forthcoming. E. Prinzivalli, Origen, in: L. Gerson (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge 2010/2015, I 283–97: 290 agrees with me; L. Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy*, Oxford 2004, 20–30; 236–40 lists Origen among the 'Nicene'; C. Marksches, *Origenes und sein Erbe*, Berlin 2007, 12 insists on the Cappadocians' indebtedness to Origen's Trinitarian thought. A.-C. Jacobsen, *Christ the Teacher of Salvation*, Münster 2015, recognises that Origen's theology paved the way for Nicaea and Chalcedon, albeit being more complex; P. Tzamalikos, *Anaxagoras, Origen, and Neoplatonism*, Berlin 2016, also concurs that Origen inspired Nicaea, Athanasius, and the Cappadocians; on pp. 1567–68 he offers a longer section, from Codex Sabaiticus 232, of a passage by Origen's *Commentary on Matthew* that I already adduced in support of Origen's thesis of the unity of οὐσία and distinction of the three hypostases in 'Origen's Anti-Subordinationism'.

19) E. g., Goodspeed (above, n. 11) 786; Pretty (above, n. 2) 11–14, with this and other elements of irreconcilability between Adamantius and Origen, elements refuted by Ramelli, *The Dialogue of Adamantius* (above, n. 4) 268–73.

20) On Origen's refutation and attitude towards Aristotelianism see my Origen's and Gregory Nyssen's Critical Reception of Aristotle, in: *Aristotle in Byzantium*, ed. M. Knezevic, Alhambra, CA 2019, and the monograph on Origen, in preparation; on his explicit references to Aristotle and Aristotelians see V. Limone, Origen's Explicit References to Aristotle and the Peripatetics, *VigChr* 72 (2018) 390–404.

Origen conceived of the λογικά (νόες, rational creatures) as provided with a body from the beginning, a subtle form of corporeality, different from the heavy and corruptible bodies and similar to the σῶμα πνευματικόν of the resurrection (the same as the present one for each human, but improved). After the fall, rational creatures were not given a body for the first time, but had their subtle body changed into heavy and perishable. Only the Trinity is absolutely incorporeal; creatures do have a body, spiritual or heavy (Princ. 2.2.2, etc.).²¹ Adamantius' view that the body is soul's συνεργόν and minister also corresponds to Origen's line (Princ. 3.6.6; 2.3.2; 4.2.7; CC 7.38): ἀνθρώπους . . . τὰς χρωμένους ψυχὰς σώμασιν.

Marinus' next objection to bodily resurrection (863a) consists in the quotation of 1 Cor 15:50. Adamantius replies that a spiritual understanding of Paul is required; Adamantius' interpretation of σάρξ here is identical to Origen, Princ. 2.10.3 (cf. CC 4.19; Sel.Ps. PG12.1673D; Or. 26.6).

Adamantius in 864d–865a quotes 1 Cor 15:29–42, but the extant Greek entirely lacks the following verses, which the Latin reports. These words, rather than being an addition of Rufinus, were surely present in the original text, given that Marinus' subsequent objection is grounded in them. They were dear to Origen.

Adamantius claims that the body that will rise will be the same as one has now, but improved: the risen body will maintain the same substance as the earthly body, but change its qualities into better: *eadem perdurante substantia, sola qualitas in melius et gloriosius immutabitur* (865e). This is Origen's position, taken over by Nyssen, as has been recently demonstrated.²² Origen, in spite of accusations levelled against him, maintained, like Adamantius, that one's resurrected body will be the same as one's earthly body, and not a different one (Princ. 3.6.6; 2.10.1–2, etc.).

Both Adamantius and Origen imply that Paul is using a deictical pronoun when he says, *corruptibile hoc induet immortalitatem*

21) See I. Ramelli, Origen, in: A. Marmodoro / S. Cartwright (eds), *A History of Mind and Body in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge 2018, 245–66; *Sōma/Body*, RAC, in preparation.

22) See I. Ramelli, Gregory of Nyssa, in: Marmodoro / Cartwright (previous note), 283–305. Further elements in the monograph in preparation, also on the continuity between the earthly and the risen body of which I speak in the following sentence.

(Princ. 2.3.2). This is one of the many subtle correspondences between the two. Adamantius posits a permanent principle in the body (as opposed to changing qualities): *substantia, natura, ratio substantialis, ratio substantiae, substantiae ueritatis ratio*, corresponding to Origen's εἶδος as metaphysical principle (essence, substance, determining the being of a reality) and οὐσίας λόγος (CC 6.64; H. Ier. 20.1, cf. Aristotle, Met. 1037a24). Adamantius' substance terminology corresponds to Origen's. Adamantius' idea that what is kept in one's resurrected body is the *ratio substantialis / ratio substantiae* (οὐσίας λόγος) of one's earthly body is what Origen states in Princ. 2.10.3. That Origen identified the εἶδος of one's body with its *ratio substantialis / λόγος* is proved by C. Ps. 1.5 preserved by Methodius, Res. 1.24 and quoted by Epiphanius, Pan. 64. The section on substance and qualities in bodies in the *Dialogue* is extant only in Latin, being absent from the extant Greek, as other sections (see below, also for the possible explanation of these differences).

Adamantius bases the resurrection not only on philosophy, but also on Scripture: this is a kind of argumentative structure typical of Origen, in both his treatises and his oral performances. Adamantius' alternative exegesis of "flesh" in 1 Cor 15:50 (flesh = sins / body's present quality, which will change) is again the same as Origen, Sel.Ps. PG 12.1096B, on body's material ὑποκείμενον changing after death, but already every day during life; the body's substantial form will not disappear, but endure, while its mode – its qualities – will change and become glorious. Origen resumed Paul's simile of the wheat grain and joined the Stoic conception of seminal λόγοι to the Aristotelian "substantial form" by making the former the bearers of the latter (1097CD).

Adamantius' theory of the resurrection coincides with Origen's. Origen admitted the resurrection of the body, but also took resurrection in a spiritual sense (C. Io. 28.7.54) – a holistic, complex notion of resurrection, later developed by Nyssen and especially Evagrius.²³ The resurrection will not involve the material ὑποκείμε-

23) Argument in I. Ramelli, Gregory Nyssen's and Evagrius' Biographical and Theological Relations, in: Eadem (ed.), *Evagrius between Origen, the Cappadocians, and Neoplatonism*, Leuven 2017, 165–231; Origen to Evagrius, in: H. Tarrant et alii (eds.), *A Companion to the Reception of Plato in Antiquity*, Leiden 2018, 271–91; *Mystical Eschatology in Gregory and Evagrius*, in: G. Maspero (ed.), *Eschatology in Gregory of Nyssa*, Leuven 2020.

vov / substratum of the body, which, unlike the substance / εἶδος, continually changes. The bodily εἶδος remains the same throughout one's life and in the resurrection, but there will be a dramatic transformation into a greater beauty (Sel.Ps. PG 12.1093.18–33). The two interpretations of death and resurrection, bodily and spiritual, do not exclude one another, but coexist. Indeed, also in Origen's Biblical exegesis both the literal and the spiritual sense(s) coexist. In Heracl. 5.12, in In ICor. 81 and 84 (44 Jenkins), and in Princ. 2.10.1–2 – where he takes over arguments already developed in *De resurrectione* – Origen explicitly rejects the position of “heretics” who denied the resurrection of the body.

Eutropius, the ‘impartial’ philosophical judge, proclaims Adamantius’ victory over Megethius, Droserius, Marinus, Valens, and Marcus, *declinantes a uia recta et ecclesiasticis dogmatibus* (866e). In his public disputations, Origen likewise defended Christian orthodoxy against opponents. Here, Eutropius identifies Adamantius as Origen: *uiae autem ueritatis idoneus satis et fidelis assertor est Origenes, qui et Adamantius*. Probably, Rufinus did not add Origen's name here, as is commonly assumed, but the extant Greek eliminated it, whereas Rufinus’ ‘Vorlage’ had it. For the Cappadocians cite the *Dialogue of Adamantius* as *Dialogue of Origen*; moreover, the expression ‘*qui et* + alternative name / byname’ is a translation of ‘ὁ καὶ + alternative name / byname’ (which Epiphanius and others used to introduce Origen's byname Adamantius), and in the extant Greek at this point (871b) another passage is present, badly corrupt and manifestly secondary, which lacks in Latin. Here, ‘pagan’ Eutropius expresses the wish of embracing the ‘orthodox’ faith. Likewise, in Eustathius’ last remarks (871c–872a), the Greek is full of additions, without parallel in Latin: Bakhuyzen himself deemed them later interpolations.²⁴

In this concluding passage, Eutropius summarises Adamantius’ positions, as defended in the *Dialogue* and as an expression of “orthodoxy”. This résumé²⁵ exactly corresponds to Origen's ideas,

24) E. g. in the final part, in 866e, where the victory of Origen over Megethius, Droserius, Marinus, Valens, and Marcus is proclaimed, as mentioned above. These interpolations are recognized also by the editor of the extant Greek text, W. H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen (above, n. 2) 236.

25) *Unum et solum deum nobis euidenter ostendit, non aduentitium, non alienum, non ignotum, non nouum et incolam uel hospitem alienae creaturae, sed eum*

including that Christ assumed not only a human body, but also a human soul,²⁶ and that Christ's assumption of humanity is indispensable to human salvation – a tenet of Origen's Christology and soteriology.

Adamantius' discussion with the Valentinians on creation, matter, evil, and freewill in Book 4 – issues extremely interesting to Maximus, Origen, and Eusebius – also reveals significant derivations from Origen. To save theodicy, Droserius, a Valentinian, claims that evil derives from matter, coeternal with God and uncreated (841b–d; 844a): Adamantius' refutation (842cd), that matter was created by God like everything else, is the selfsame as Origen's,²⁷ including Adamantius' rejection of the Valentinian interpretation of *terra autem erat inuisibilis et incomposita*, a rejection corresponding to Princ. 4.4.6 (declaring these words to be evidence of matter's original lack of form, not of its coeternity with God). Adamantius and Origen share the defence of the creation of both matter and its qualities by God (Princ. 2.1.4; 4.4.7–8).

In the *Dialogue*, the debate over matter's qualities depends on the larger question of creation, as in Origen's extant Greek works (CC 3.41–42; 4.56–57; 6.77). Discussion of philosophical views of matter, qualities, and their transformation in Or. 4.27 confirms the centrality of this issue in Origen. It is no accident that the Philocalists excerpted this section, corresponding to Eusebius' excerpt from "Maximus". Even closer are the convergences between Adamantius (from 846c) and Origen (Princ. 3) on freewill and the non-substan-

qui propriae conditionis et facturae sit dominus, cui subiecta sint omnia, cui non materia coaeterna, nec aliud aliquid aequale illi, qui ex nullis exstantibus iuxta rationem uniuersa creauerit, cuius uerbum ac filius, assumens hominis naturam, id est animam et carnem, dispensationem humanae salutis expleuerit, non erubescens assumere quod ipse creauerit, ut et salutem his quos esse fecerat largiretur. Qui pro sua pietate etiam resuscitaturum se hominem repromisit, cum corpore pariter immortalitatem positurum et beatitudinis gloria creatoris liberalitate donandum, qui et secundum arbitrii libertatem iuste omnes asseritur ad iudicium uocaturus, cui nihil obsistere potest, cui omnis potestas subiecta est (871–873).

26) Princ. 2.8.2; 4.4.3–4; 2.6.4–5; 2.8.4; 4.4.4. See I. L. E. Ramelli, Atticus and Origen on the Soul of God the Creator: From the "Pagan" to the Christian Side of Middle Platonism, *JRPh* 10 (2011) 13–35; further arguments in the monograph.

27) H. Gen. 1.1; Princ. 1.3.3; 2.1.4; 2.4.3; C. Io. 1.17 (4.22.14); Rufinus, *Apol. ad Anast.* 6.

tial origin of evil: both, against the Valentinian link of evil with matter, maintain that evil arises from freewill, a gift of God to humans (848c), to choose Good voluntarily (Princ. 4.4.8).

On theodicy and apokatastasis (ἀποκατάστασις or universal restoration), a typical doctrine of Origen, the latter and Adamantius are in full agreement. Adamantius' argument (843bff.) that two non-generated and uncreated entities cannot subsist together is the same as Maximus of Tyre's (Dialexis 41, in connection with a broader issue on evil, matter, and God, dealing with theodicy), with whom Origen was probably acquainted. Again, theodicy occasions Adamantius' important treatment of apokatastasis in 848e – one of the most outstanding points of contact with Origen's thinking, including his dealing with all rational creatures (not only humans), his insistence on the negation of a perpetual ἀπόλλεια, and his use of the parable of the lost sheep in reference to apokatastasis. Adamantius, indeed, offers here a précis of Origen's philosophy of history and eschatology.²⁸

Now, this discussion is completely lacking in the extant Greek. It is present only in Rufinus' version – likely much closer to the original than the Greek we have. Whereas it is generally assumed that Rufinus added this passage, I deem it more probable that the original text included it, and Rufinus translated it, but it was subsequently expurgated in the Greek by opponents of apokatastasis after the 'condemnation' of Origenism under Justinian, since in 849a Adamantius is declared to have expressed the orthodox

28) *Si labitur quis et decidat, a diuina eius prouidentia nusquam prorsus abscedat, nec omnino aliquid sit quod illi penitus pereat. Et super omnia adhuc illud uidendum est, quod ad cunctam rationabilem naturam quanta et quam minima pars homo est, qui similiter ut ceterae omnes rationabiles naturae arbitrii uoluntate donatus est, qui tamen uelut ouis errans per ignorantiae montes et colles boni pastoris humeris reportatus est et restitutus est ad illas nonaginta et nouem oues quae non errauerunt. Quid ergo tibi uidetur, qui hoc ita sentis? Ne una erraret ouicula, nonaginta et nouem ouium profectus et gloria debuit impediri? Impeditum namque fuerat, si naturae rationabili libertas arbitrii, per quam illae nonaginta et nouem in summis excelsis profectibus permanserunt, non fuisset indulta, quandoquidem nec eorum qui quo modo oberrauerant salutem dispensatio diuina despexerit, sed stadium quoddam praesentem hunc et uisibilem mundum posuerit, in quo, concertantium et aduersantium agone moderato, certaminis praemia proposuerit regressum ad pristinum statum, dum per arbitrii libertatem quae illuc ducunt eligi et nihilominus et respui quae non sinunt possunt.*

position. Rufinus, instead, who supported apokatastasis,²⁹ had no problem in deeming apokatastasis orthodox.

Another interesting example of how passages on apokatastasis were deleted from manuscripts is Eriugena's translation of Nyssen's *De hominis opificio*, a work in which apokatastasis is prominent. Eriugena's version is known as *De imagine* – the title with which John indicated Gregory's work.³⁰ Notably, in the only manuscript in which it is preserved,³¹ the only chapter that was dropped at some point in the ms. tradition – while it was certainly translated by Eriugena, as proved by an anthology which contains it, albeit with textual corruptions³² – is precisely a chapter containing a clear reference to apokatastasis.³³ I suspect this section did not fall out of the manuscript tradition accidentally.

That Rufinus translated an original Greek text is confirmed by Greek loanwords here, such as *stadium* and *agon*, extremely common metaphors in Origen (Adamantius' words almost render Origen, H. Gen. 16.7: *in carne positi agones mundi huius et certamina sustinemus*), and by the expression *regressum ad primum statum*, which translates ἡ εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἀποκατάστασις – typical of Origen, and of Nyssen, who derived it from Origen. Adamantius even takes over Origen's adaptation of the Stoic theory of οἰκειώσις within apokatastasis.³⁴ Adamantius' statement that apokatastasis is

29) I. L. E. Ramelli, *The Christian Doctrine of Apokatastasis*, Leiden 2013, 627–658, with the reviews by A. Meredith, *JPT* 8.2 (2014) 255–57; M. Edwards, *JThS* 65.2 (2014) 718–24; J. van Oort, *VigChr* 64 (2014) 352–3; C. DeWet, *JECH* 5.2 (2015) 184–7; S. Nemes, *JATH* 3 (2015) 226–33; G. Karamanolis, *JPT* 10.1 (2016) 142–6; R. Parry, *IJSTh* 18.3 (2016) 335–8.

30) Ed. M. Cappuyns, *Le De imagine de Grégoire de Nysse traduit par Erigène*, *RTAM* 32 (1965) 205–62.

31) Bamberg B. IV. 13, discovered by Cappuyns.

32) Vat. Reg. 195 (ninth/tenth century) includes as an excerpt (fol. 61v–62r) exactly the chapter missing from Bamberg codex: in Eriugena's translation it fell between Chapters 22 and 23 (= Gregory, *Hom. op.* 22).

33) *Peracta quidem hominum genitura eius quae termino conterminari tempus, et sic omnium adunari, et humanum a corruptibili ac terreno ad impassibile et sempiternum, hoc mihi videtur. Beatus apostolus considerans predicare, per epistolam ad Corintheos [sic], propter repentinum temporis statum, et iterum in unum futuram moventium resolutionem ...* (see above, n. 32 for this locus).

34) On Origen's reception see the argument by I. L. E. Ramelli, *The Stoic Doctrine of οἰκειώσις and its Transformation in Christian Platonism*, *Apeiron* 47

the reward for the agonistic effort of virtue perfectly corresponds to Origen's idea in C. Io. 13.46.299. Adamantius' discussion of apokatastasis refers to the parable of the lost sheep (representing humanity) and Jesus' action of restoring it, which Origen interpreted precisely as an expression of apokatastasis.³⁵

In 856e, nine lines in Latin, again, lack in Greek; they were probably deleted in the extant Greek since Adamantius here, based on scriptural quotations (1 Cor 15:47; Gen 2:7) absent in Greek, expounds apokatastasis as the restoration of God's image in humans. Moreover, his present argument is absolutely coherent with what he has previously said, while in the extant Greek there is a logical gap.³⁶ The so-called theology of the image associated with apokatastasis and the Adam-Christ parallel were very dear to Origen, and Adamantius deploys them here; the last lines of the passage lacking in Greek take over Origen's key-notion that God had to become fully human that humans might be deified, an idea notoriously taken over by Athanasius, Augustine, and others.

Adamantius' attack upon docetism (804d, 849c–850cd) – a tenet of Marinus' 'Bardaisanite' doctrine (849b) – closely reflects Origen's view concerning Christ's full humanity in body and soul. Adamantius adduces, even impromptu, many Biblical quotations from OT and NT in support of a thesis, as in Origen's *Dialogue with Heraclides*, homilies, commentaries, and Περὶ Ἀρχῶν, where every philosophical argument is supported by Biblical quotations.

(2014) 116–40, received, e. g., by A. Djakovac, *The Usage and Development of the Term προαίρεσις from Aristotle to Maximus*, *Theoria* 58 (2015) 69–86; Gretchen Reydam's-Schils, *Platonism and Stoicism in Clement of Alexandria: Becoming like God*, forthcoming; J. LaRae Ferguson, *Christ in the Eye of the Beholder: A Re-reading of Pauline Charts in the Autobiographical Conversion Narratives of Galatians 1 and 1 Corinthians 15*, in: H. Loehr / A. Despotis (eds), *Religious and Philosophical Conversion*, Leiden forthcoming.

35) Fr. 58b–c on Luke; Fr. Ps. 118.176. Fr. Jer. 28; Fr. Ps. 18.6; Sel. Ps. PG 12.1628.

36) *Uterque tamen homo designatur. Denique dicit quia, Primus homo de terra terrenum, secundus homo de coelo. Sed sicut iste qui terrenus dicitur non potuisset homo dici, nisi fuisset coelitus inspiratus, insufflauit enim deus in faciem eius spiritum uitae, et factus est homo in animam uiuentem, ita et iste, qui de coelo dicitur, homo dici non posset, nisi uerbo coelesti caro sociaretur humana, ut, sicut tunc ille terrenus suscepit imaginem deitatis, ita et nunc iste coelestis susciperet humanitatis imaginem, ut, cum in eo nostra fuisset imago reparata, ita demum et ipsius imago restitueretur in nobis.*

Origen knew Scripture by heart and continually engaged in its interpretation. Likewise, Adamantius' recourse to typology and his theory of typology (853bc) correspond to Origen's own theory (Princ. 4) and use of typology.³⁷ For Origen this supported the unity of OT and NT (in an anti-Marcionite and anti-Gnostic perspective), to the demonstration of which Adamantius too is committed.

Adamantius' anti-docetic position fully corresponds to Origen's ideas.³⁸ Origen too, like Adamantius, denies that Christ's birth, death, and resurrection took place *δοκῆσει* (e.g. Fr.Io. 53; CC 2.16). Adamantius' main argument against docetism³⁹ is identical to Origen's: if Christ's incarnation, death, and resurrection are only apparent, then human salvation is challenged. Adamantius buttresses his argument (854ef) through two major quotations, 1 Cor 15:14; 5:22–3 – among the favourite Biblical pillars of Origen's doctrine of resurrection and apokatastasis, together with 1 Cor 15:24–8.

Adamantius argues that Christ was born from Mary – taking from her his humanity – not through Mary, against Marinus' claim that Christ *per Mariam natus est, sed non de Maria, sicut aqua per fistulam transit, nihil ex ea accipiens* (855e). Origen, like Adamantius, maintained that Christ *de Maria corpus adsumit*, 'from Mary', not 'through Mary' (Princ. 4.4.5); likewise, *nasceretur ex Maria* is the formula that Jerome reports from Origen (Apol. 2.2). Origen is adamant that Christ assumed a human body; to support this he has again recourse to the argument from our salvation (es. Princ. 4.4.4; H. Luc. 17).

To refute the Bardaisanite Marinus, Adamantius cites the angel's words to Mary (Luke 1:35): Origen often used Luke 1:35 against docetism.⁴⁰ Adamantius observes that Jesus called himself "son of the human being" (852b–853a): the insistence on this

37) I. Ramelli, The Philosophical Stance of Allegory in Stoicism and its Reception, IJCT 18 (2011) 335–71; Origen's Philosophical Theology, in preparation, Ch. 4.

38) Heracl. 5–6; C. Rom. 9.2; H. Luc. 14; C. Gal. PG 14.1296AB; Princ. 1 praef. 4.

39) Dial. 850f–851a; 852b; 853d–854e; cf. 857a, 855c.

40) Princ. 1 praef. 4; C. Io. 32.16; 6.11.67; H. Ier. 1.8; C. Matth. 10.17; Princ. 1.3.2; 2.6.7.

title is typical of Origen: it occurs 123 times in his extant Greek works alone, and is also explained by Origen in the same way as it is by Adamantius.⁴¹ Adamantius' contextual reference to the inner human being also reflects a characteristic conception of Origen, based on both Paul and Platonism.⁴²

Thus, a painstaking investigation and comparison between the ideas and arguments of Adamantius and those of Origen suggests that the reasons usually adduced to deny the identification of Adamantius' thought with Origen's are shaky and depend upon a scarce knowledge of Origen's true ideas (as far as these can be reconstructed).

Methodius in his own dialogues might have drawn material from our original *Dialogue*, rather than the reverse. Methodius' *Symposium* and *De autexusio* are full of Origenian ideas, and his criticism of Origen is limited to the modality of bodily resurrection, and only due to a misapprehension (of εἶδος as μορφή).⁴³ Socrates even attests that he changed his mind on this point and, after writing *De resurrectione*, he retracted his attack on Origen and composed a dialogue in deep esteem of Origen (HE 6.13).

The *Dialogue* shares much with Methodius' *De autexusio* and *De resurrectione*. The passage taken from the former is the same quoted by Eusebius, PE 7.22, and by Philoc. 24. But it is uncertain that the *Dialogue* depends on Methodius: as seen above, in the conclusions of Section I, Methodius may have borrowed from the *Dialogue*'s original Greek, used by Rufinus and the Philocalists (who both identified Adamantius with Origen). To defend freewill,

41) *Dialogue*; Mart. 35; C. Io. 32.25.323–325; C. Matth. 17.20.

42) CC 6.63; C. Cant. prol.; C. Io. 20.22; C. Rom. 1.19; 7.4; H. Gen. 1.13; Heracl.; Princ. 4.4.9. This is a Platonic (ἐντὸς ἀνθρώπου, Resp. 9.598A7), Pauline, and Philonic heritage taken over not only by Origen, but also by Plotinus (Enn. 1.1.10.5–15). See Christoph Marksches, *Die platonische Metapher vom "inneren Menschen"*, ZKG 105 (1994) 1–17; George van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology in Context*, Tübingen 2008, 358–74; Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, *Jakobus und Paulus über das Innere des Menschen*, NTS 62 (2016) 1–30: 22–30, esp. on Rom 6–8; my monograph on Origen (n. 37 above), on Origen's conflation of the above three heritages.

43) Ramelli (above, n. 29), 260–73: 265–6; *The Reception of Origen's Thought; further in Origen of Alexandria, also with discussion of Katharina Bracht* (ed.), *Methodius of Olympos: State of the Art and New Perspectives*, Berlin 2017.

Methodius took over Origen's anti-Valentinian arguments (reproduced in our *Dialogue* in Book 4, from 840a, against Droserius and Valens: this section closely corresponds to parts of Methodius' *De autexusio* in ideas and argument, and even verbal expressions). Methodius (ca. † 311) wrote his treatises in ca. 280–310. The *Dialogue's* source or original form, relying on Origen's ideas, is likely earlier. Eusebius may have drawn his quotation from Methodius or the *Dialogue*. But he also knew that Origen's / Adamantius' arguments there, concerning God, matter, evil, creation, and theodicy, were close to those of "Maximus" (perhaps Maximus of Tyre), whereas the Philocalists, who read Eusebius and the *Dialogue*, ascribed them to Origen.

Indeed, if Origen knew Maximus of Tyre's thought and discussed it in *De oratione* and elsewhere (see above), and if Adamantius' arguments reflect Origen's ideas, as I argued, this would explain the double attribution of the same material to "Maximus" by Eusebius and to Origen (identified with Adamantius) by the Philocalists, and the presence of the same material in Methodius' *De autexusio*: he probably drew it, not from Eusebius, but from the original *Dialogue* or the source of the *Dialogue*.

The *Dialogue of Adamantius*, indeed, may derive from one of the many διαλέξεις that Origen held in his maturity, in Bar Yamma's time, or more probably – given the occasional inaccuracy of the theses ascribed to Origen's opponents – from the reworking of genuine Origenian material into such a frame, clearly by Christian authors, preoccupied with orthodoxy and the only users of Adamantius' byname for Origen ('pagan' authors never used it).⁴⁴ This was later translated by Rufinus, who identified Adamantius with Origen, whereas the extant Greek is much later, contains references to a post-Constantinian situation, Byzantine terms, and many strategic cuts, additions, and modifications.

Philoc. 24 quotes the *Dialogue's* section on matter, evil, and God (from the Greek 'Vorlage' also available to Rufinus) that is excerpted by Eusebius, PE 7.22. The Philocalists ascribe it to Origen, Eusebius to "Maximus". The Philocalists noticed this contradiction in 24.8 and call the *Dialogue of Adamantius* "Dialogue of Origen"

44) Full analysis in my *The Dialogue of Adamantius*, I (above, n. 3), section II.

(as Anastasius Sinaita, Quaest. 48, and Praedestinatus 21 do): “Origen’s διάλογος (or διάλεκτος) with Marcionites and other heretics”. Origen is recorded to have had many public debates against other Christians on doctrine, on the basis of Scripture and argument: one with Heraclides, preserved in a Toura papyrus probably based on Pamphilus’ and Eusebius’ edition, and others, now lost, with Candidus the Valentinian; with Beryllus in Bostra; with some heretic Arabs (Eusebius, HE 6.37); with Jewish rabbis; and other public διαλέξεις (Eusebius, HE 6.36). One of these might have been a debate subsequently reworked in our *Dialogue*. Peculiar to our *Dialogue* is that the arbiter is a pagan philosopher here, Eutropius, who functions as an expression of pure λόγος, who twice, at the end of Book 2 and of the whole work, proclaims the victory of Adamantius (Origen). Likewise in the case of real dialogues of Origen, written down or reported by sources: the *Dialogue with Heraclides* and the disputations with Beryllus and with the Arabs ended with Origen’s victory. Also, both in the *Dialogue of Adamantius* and in that with Heraclides, Adamantius’ and Origen’s parts respectively are much ampler than those of the other characters.

Exactly as Origen does in the debates with Beryllus, Heraclides, and the Arabs, so does also Adamantius in our *Dialogue* contrast doctrinal deviations on the basis of Scripture and rational argument, and establish orthodoxy. Our *Dialogue* in its own prologue is called Ἀδαμαντίου διάλεκτος / διάλεξις / διάλογος, whose title is: “On the Orthodox Faith in God”. The colophon of the ms. of the *Dialogue with Heraclides* reads: Ὠριγένους διάλεκτοι πρὸς Ἡρακλείδην, “On the Father, the Son, and the Soul”. The structure is identical and derives from Pamphilus’ and Eusebius’ edition, who collected Origen’s dialogues. The introductory formulas for each speaker in our *Dialogue* and in that with Heraclides (“Heraclides said [εἶπεν] ... Origen said [εἶπεν]”) are also identical. The verb ζητέω occurs frequently in Adamantius’ words in our *Dialogue*, and Origen’s discussion with Beryllus is indicated by Eusebius as ζητήσεις and διαλέξεις (HE 6.37); Origen himself designates his debates with the Jews as ζήτησις and διάλεξις, and, as a ‘zetetic’ in his philosophical method, had recourse to the verb ζητέω very often.⁴⁵

45) Origen’s Philosophical Theology (above, n. 37), Ch. 5. A separate investigation will be devoted to Origen’s “zetetic” attitude and its terminology.

Adamantius' opponents are Marcionites and Valentinians, 'heretics' of Origen's own time, not belonging to a later heresiological framework;⁴⁶ this is a significant point: the *Dialogue* was not conceived to refute 'heretics' of a later time and attributed to a speaker who bears Origen's byname. The original setting of the *Dialogue of Adamantius* is Origen's day. Marinus in this dialogue is Bar Yamma (a disciple of Bardaisan: see the next section), and Megethius, another interlocutor of Adamantius, is depicted as a younger contemporary of Marcion, who was his bishop. Therefore, he was a contemporary of Origen.

In our *Dialogue*, characters return more than once upon the same point: this is typical of an oral debate and happens in other authentic dialogues of Origen. The style itself, with brief and paratactical sentences (e. g. in Marinus' speech), is characteristic of spoken language. It is likely that Rufinus in his version has preserved the account of a dispute.

III. Rufinus' Latin, the Extant Greek, Latin-to-Greek Translations, the Historia Monachorum, and Other Relevant Texts

Assessing the reliability of Rufinus' translation is crucial not only from the linguistic, but also from the doctrinal viewpoint, since it includes passages on apokatastasis that are absent from the extant Greek. I argue for the anteriority of Rufinus' version to the extant Greek.⁴⁷ Rufinus' translation seems closer to the original redaction of the *Dialogue* than the extant Greek is.

46) Thorough discussion in the full study on the *Dialogue* in preparation.

47) This seems to have been also the view of Karl Paul Caspari, the discoverer of Rufinus' translation in 1876 in the Bibliothek zu Schlettstadt, and its first editor in 1883 in: *Kirchenhistorische Anecdota* (available now Bruxelles 1964); his opinion was followed by Zahn and others. The editor of the subsequent edition, Vinzenz Buchheit, was much more suspicious of Rufinus' translation: V. Buchheit, *Rufinus von Aquileia als Fälscher des Adamantiosdialogs*, *ByZ* 51 (1958) 314–28, but he did not take into account what I point out, e. g. (among much else) that the passages on apokatastasis cannot have been added by Rufinus, given the consequentiality in the dialogue in Latin and the disruptions in the extant Greek, but must have been dropped subsequently in the Greek, for obvious doctrinal reasons. Very recently,

The Greek not only has cuts or additions in doctrinally strategic points, but even implies that the emperor is a Christian in the time in which the dialogue is set: *vñv δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως ὄντος θεοσεβοῦς* (816d),⁴⁸ whereas Rufinus' Latin only refers to persecutions: *in persecutionibus sumus semper; persecutionem patimur ... Christi discipuli persecutionum saevitiam tolerant*. This obviously does not refer to Rufinus' time, but to that of Origen, who indeed insisted on Christians as objects of ongoing persecutions, e. g. in *Princ.* 4.1.1–5, also available in Greek in *Philoc.* 1.1–5, and reproduced by Pamphilus, *Apol.* 84: *non sine ingenti odio aduersum se commoto ... frequenter et cruciatibus afligantur, non numquam etiam agantur in mortem*.

The secondary nature and late dating of the extant Greek is also revealed by other significant details, such as the presence of the adjective *φάλσος* five times in 806b–808b.⁴⁹ Now, *φάλσα* is not Greek, but Latin, and indeed ms. F (and only this) has five evident corrections, the first into *ψευδῆ*, the second, fourth, and fifth into *πλαστά*, and the third into *πλαστῶ*. These obviously endeavour to rectify a Latin term, by replacing it with real Greek terms (*ψευδός* and *πλαστός* instead of *φάλσος*). Rufinus' Latin reads *falsa/o* in all five loci, the same term that was transposed into Greek.⁵⁰ The

A. Westergren, *The Monastic Paradox: Desert Ascetics as Founders, Fathers, and Benefactors in Early Christian Historiography*, *VigChr* 72 (2018) 283–317 takes no position concerning the priority of either Rufinus' Latin or the extant Greek.

48) In 816e; 872a (which already Andreas Rivetus declared impossible to refer to Origen's time), it cannot but refer to a post-Constantinian situation: in the former passage it is stated that the present *θεοσεβής* emperor has destroyed pagan temples and statues, and in the latter that kings and governors gather together with bishops. The Latin involves a more general and optative statement: kings, chiefs of nations, and all humanity should obey God (*deum ... cui obtemperare reges terrae et principes populorum atque omne convenit humanum genus*).

49) Ἐγὼ δύναμαι δεῖξαι ὅτι φάλσα ἐστὶ τὰ εὐαγγέλια ... Μᾶρκον καὶ Λουκᾶν οὐκ ἔσχε μαθητὰς ὁ Χριστός· ἐντεῦθεν ἐλέγχεσθε φάλσα ποιοῦντες ... τῷ σῶ φάλσῳ οὐ πιστεύω ἀποστολικῶ ... ἐγὼ ἐλέγγω ἐτέρωθεν ὅτι φάλσα ἐστὶ τὰ εὐαγγέλια ... διαφωνοῦσι τὰ εὐαγγέλια καὶ ἄλλα καὶ ἄλλα λέγουσιν, ὅθεν φαίνεται φάλσα.

50) *Euangelia, quae nos legitis, falsa sunt ... Marcum et Lucam nec habuit discipulos Christus, et ex hoc ipso quod falsa sunt approbantur ... tuo falso codici non credo ... ego ostendo quia falsa sunt euangelia ... discrepant ipsa euangelia et diuversa dicunt, unde et falsa credenda sunt*. Note that here *codici* corresponds, in Greek, to τῷ ἀποστολικῶ, meaning the corpus of the letters of Paul, which is also the title of Marcion's collection of the letters of Paul the Apostle. Marcionism is a prominent 'heresy' to combat in the *Dialogue*, as well as it was for Origen all his life long.

Greek seems to translate a Latin text (see below about similar cases in *Historia monachorum* and other late texts). Attestations of φάλλσος in Greek literature are only few and very late, from Byzantine authors. Likewise, derivations such as φαλλσόγραφος, φαλλσεύματα or φαλλσάματα, the verb φαλλσεύειν, and the adverb φάλλσως, are attested only in very late works, much later than the time of Origen or even that of Rufinus.

Likewise, in 809b, in the extant Greek, Σωκρατιανοί is not an original Greek word, being coined through the Latin ending *-(i)anus*. Indeed, in Rufinus' Latin there is *Socratianus*. The Greek seems to render, again, a Latin original. Similarly, in 809d Megethius, Adamantius' Marcionite opponent, calls Adamantius *Socratianus*, plural in Greek: Σωκρατιανοί (*ego Christianus dicor, sed si tu mihi nomen hominis obicis, et ego possum de te dicere quia et tu Socratianus es* = ἐγὼ Χριστιανὸς λέγομαι, καὶ γὰρ ὧδε λέγονται Σωκρατιανοί τινες). Again, this is a Latin term. The same is the case with *Christianus*, whence Χριστιανός, attested for the first time in Acts 11:26 – a direct derivation from Latin (*Christianus* was probably coined in the bureaucratic Roman milieu). In the extant Greek, Σωκρατιανοί derives from Latin *Socratiani*, whereas the original Greek should have read Σωκρατικοί.

Significant is also Marinus' name. He is introduced in 834a, just after Adamantius' refutation of Marcionism, and is presented as a follower of the Christian philosopher Bardaisan of Edessa. He should therefore be identified with Bar Yamma, a disciple of Bardaisan, who appears as a character in the *Liber Legum Regionum*, a dialogue written in Edessa probably by a disciple of Bardaisan on the basis of his master's argument against fate.⁵¹ Discussion in the *Liber* concerning God, human freewill, evil, and eschatology is thematically close to Adamantius' debate with Marinus in the *Dialogue of Adamantius*, concerning creation, God, evil, free will, eschatology, and docetism. I pointed out even precise correspondences in questions and answers on freewill. Now, Bardaisan died in 222, and a setting of our *Dialogue* in 240s – when Origen was

51) I. L. E. Ramelli, Bardaisan of Edessa, Piscataway 2009, 70–106; Bardaisan on Nature, Fate, and Freewill, Tübingen, forthcoming; Bardaisan of Edessa, Origen, and Imperial Philosophy, in: Greek Culture & Interaction in the Levant 4th cent. BC – 7th cent. CE = Aram 30.1–2 (2018), 337–353.

in his full maturity – would explain why it features, not Bardaisan himself, but a direct disciple of his. In Rufinus’ version, he is *Marinus Bardesanites*; in the extant Greek, ΜΑΡΙΝΟΣ Βαρδησιανιστής. The Greek clearly transliterates the Latin form, not vice-versa: only in Latin does Marinus’ name have a meaning (“marine, belonging to the sea”). Now, *Marinus* seems to me to translate Syriac ‘Bar Yamma’, the name of one of Bardaisan’s disciples in the aforementioned *Book of the Laws of Countries*, a philosophical dialogue similar to our *Dialogue* and dating to the Severan age; Bardaisan is the main character therein. Bar Yamma means “Son of the Sea”: *Marinus* is its Latin translation. Its direct translation into Greek would have been Θαλάσσιος or Πόντιος, not *Marinus* / Μαρῖνος. Rufinus’ Greek ‘Vorlage’ might have had Θαλάσσιος, but the extant Greek appears to be, not a direct translation of ‘Bar Yamma’, but a transliteration of its Latin translation.

There are further remarkable discrepancies between the Latin and the extant Greek: for example, from the doctrinal point of view, as analysed above in Section II, a long passage on apokatastasis is lacking in the extant Greek, but present in Rufinus (848e), and I argued that it is more probable that Rufinus’ ‘Vorlage’ included it, and it was expurgated afterwards by people who felt embarrassed by this doctrine after its official ‘condemnation’ under Justinian. Other passages on apokatastasis have been dropped in Greek. The extant Greek also has a substantial passage in 848de that is absent from Rufinus’ version, but present in Leontius’ quotation of Methodius’ *De autexusio* (46–7 Bonw.). Given the late date of the quotation, it is uncertain whether Rufinus abridged the original text, as for instance Vinzenz Buchheit would have it,⁵² or preserved the original redaction, while the extant Greek includes an addition.

The *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*⁵³ is an interesting text in connection with the *Dialogue*: it was composed in Greek around 395 and, like the *Dialogue*, translated into Latin by Rufinus, prob-

52) See Buchheit, “Rufinus als Fälscher” (above, n. 47).

53) Edition of the extant Greek: A.-J. Festugière, *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*, Bruxelles 1961; edition of Rufinus: E. Schultz-Flügel, *Tyrannii Rufini Historia monachorum*, Berlin 1990; trans. N. Russell, *The Historia monachorum in Aegypto*, Kalamazoo 1980.

ably around 403–404.⁵⁴ It recounts, for a monastic community (“pious brotherhood”) on the Mount of Olives, the story of seven monks from Rufinus’ monastery in Jerusalem, who travelled to Egypt and met ascetics there.⁵⁵ After their return to Jerusalem, one of their circle composed this work, without echos from classical ‘pagan’ literature, but with many from Scripture and some from Athanasius’ *Vita Antonii*.⁵⁶ It was commonly assumed that the translation differs from the extant Greek because Rufinus altered his ‘Vorlage’ – what is also assumed with our *Dialogue* – to describe the Egyptian monks as Origenians. Comparisons with Sozomen and Syriac recensions, however, had scholars suppose that Rufinus translated faithfully the original Greek, whereas the extant Greek reveals alterations, deletions (of sections related to Origenism), and additions. This surely happened with our *Dialogue*.

Since our *Dialogue*’s extant Greek has words translated from Latin and corresponding to Rufinus’ version, one could surmise that the original Greek was lost at a certain point, and the extant Greek is an altered translation of Rufinus’ Latin. This, however, cannot be the case, as it appears (and the later Greek redactor must have had both the Greek ‘Vorlage’ and the Latin translation available), since the parallels between Eusebius’ excerpt and the extant Greek, the *Philocalia* and the extant Greek (and Methodius and the extant Greek) seem to be too close. Therefore, the extant Greek, albeit tampered with, must be based on a Greek ‘Vorlage’ – likely the same used by Rufinus –, which the later Greek redactor altered (including for doctrinal reasons, as indicated above), having also the Latin translation available.

In late antiquity and Byzantine times, translations of theological texts from Latin to Greek were relatively common, along with the more foreseeable translation of Greek into Latin in all of late

54) So A. DeVogüé, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique dans l’antiquité*, III, Paris 1996, 317–20.

55) G. Frank, *The Historia monachorum and Ancient Travel Writing*, StPatr 30 (1997) 191–5; W. Harmless, *Desert Christians*, Oxford 2004, 290–98.

56) A. Cain, *The Greek Historia monachorum and Athanasius’ Life of Antony*, VigChr 67 (2013) 349–63, at the same time notes that Antony is somehow relativised in the *Historia*, vs. Athanasius’ biography.

antiquity.⁵⁷ Gregory the Great's Latin *Pastoral Rule*, for instance, was translated into Greek in 602 by order of Anastasius of Antioch. Zacharias of Rome († 752) translated himself Gregory the Great's Latin *Dialogues* into Greek.⁵⁸ The Acts of the 649 Lateran Synod were translated into Greek (or possibly composed directly in Greek but pretending to be a translation) after a petition of Greek monks in Rome.⁵⁹ Especially between the eighth and tenth centuries, Greek-speaking communities in Italy and North Africa translated texts from Latin into Greek, including the *Martyrium Perpetuae*, the *Acts of Peter and Paul*, Jerome's *De viris illustribus* – its Greek version was attributed by Erasmus to Sophronius, a friend of Jerome's.⁶⁰ Translations from Latin to Greek continued in the late Byzantine period, including Byzantine Greek translations of Aquinas' works.⁶¹

Latinisms, so common in both our *Dialogue* and the *Historia*, are well present in the late, sixth-century Greek of Cassian the Sabaite;⁶² e. g. βίσεκστον appears from the sixth century onward. Erwin Preuschen, the first editor of the *Historia monachorum*, deemed the Latin original, and the Greek its translation; André-Jean Festugière, like Butler, considered the Greek original, but in a form lost to us but available to Rufinus (the same is probably the case

57) H. Marti, Übersetzer der Augustin-Zeit. Interpretation von Selbstzeugnissen, München 1974; B. Rochette, Du grec au latin et du latin au grec. Les problèmes de la traduction dans l'antiquité gréco-latine, *Latomus* 54 (1995) 245–61; A. Rigolio, Translation of Greek Texts in Late Antiquity, in: G. K. Giannakis et al. (eds), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, Leiden 2014, III 436–41, esp. 436–7; C. Rapp, Hagiography and Monastic Literature between Greek East and Latin West in Late Antiquity, in: Centro Italiano Studi Alto Medioevo (ed.), *Cristianità d'Occidente e cristianità d'Oriente*, Spoleto 2004, 1221–81; T. Denecker, *Ideas on Language in Early Latin Christianity*, Leiden 2017, 158–69.

58) PL 77.147–432.

59) ACO2 I 55.

60) But see E. C. Richardson, *Hieronymus liber de viris illustribus*, Gennadius, der sogenannte Sophronius, Leipzig 1896 (TU 14.1).

61) See documentation in D. M. Searby (ed.), *Never the Twain Shall Meet? Latins and Greeks Learning from Each Other in Byzantium* (*Byzantinisches Archiv Series Philosophica*, 2), Berlin 2018, esp. F. Tinnfeld, *Translations from Latin to Greek: A Contribution to Late Byzantine Intellectual History* (9–19).

62) I do not evaluate P. Tzamalikos' hypothesis about Cassian, but the Latinisms are evident.

with our *Dialogue*). Comparisons with Sozomen – who draws elements from Greek not found in Latin, and also elements from Latin not found in Greek – and the Syriac recensions, led scholars such as Caroline Hammond Bammel (below) to suppose that Rufinus translated faithfully the original Greek *Historia*, whereas the extant Greek reveals alterations, deletions, and additions (this surely happened with our *Dialogue*). Sozomen knows passages present in Rufinus but absent in the extant Greek, and others present in Greek but absent in Rufinus – a similar situation to our *Dialogue*: its extant Greek seems to have known both Rufinus' Latin and the original Greek text. Literacy in Latin in the late antique Greek East was not widespread, but existent, especially confined to officials in civil administration, intellectuals, and lawyers.⁶³ In the *Historia's* Greek redactions, fifth-century scribal attempts tried to synchronise, at least structurally, the Greek text and Rufinus' translation. Socrates also did, and used not just Eusebius in Greek, but also Rufinus' *Church History*. Something similar happened with the *Dialogue*: its redactor(s) could read both Greek and Latin and apparently used both the Greek 'Vorlage' and the Latin version. Socrates himself uses both the Latin and the Greek forms of names (e. g. of Apollo)⁶⁴, showing that he is using two sources – exactly as the *Dialogue of Adamantius* (see above my notes on Μάρπινος, Σωκράτιανοί, etc., coming from Latin).

Caroline Bammel deemed the extant Greek of *Historia monachorum* a "revision as a result of the fear of Origenism caused by Theophilus of Alexandria's expulsion of the Nitrian monks in 399/400".⁶⁵ The four Syriac recensions confirm the anteriority of Rufinus to the extant Greek according to Peter Tóth.⁶⁶ In the *Historia*, the passages that have disappeared in the extant Greek are

63) A. Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome*, Oxford 2013, 637–44.

64) As noted by A. Cain, *The Greek Historia Monachorum in Aegypto*, Oxford 2016, 21.

65) C. Bammel, *Problems of the Historia Monachorum*, *JThS* 47 (1996) 92–104.

66) P. Tóth, *Lost in Translation. An Evagrian Term in the Different Versions of the Historia Monachorum*, in: G. Heidl / R. Somos (eds), *Origeniana IX*, Leuven 2009, 613–21. Cf. Idem, *Honey on the Brim of the Poison Cup*, in: J. Glucker / C. Burnett (eds), *Greek into Latin from Antiquity to the Nineteenth Century*, London 2012, 117–29.

all related to Origenism; Bammel therefore concluded: “the Greek has undergone a clumsy and incompetent revision as a result of fear of Origenism” – a position followed by Philippe Luisier.⁶⁷ Andrew Cain deems the Greek redaction composed by a monk in Rufinus’ monastery in 395–397, to popularise the core principles of ascetic mysticism promulgated by Evagrius, and later translated by Rufinus, who, in Cain’s view, made phraseological adjustments and sometimes substantial additions.⁶⁸ Whenever Rufinus deviates from the extant Greek, Cain attributes alterations and additions to Rufinus.⁶⁹ This is a position similar to that of Vinzenz Buchheit for the *Dialogue of Adamantius*, outlined above.⁷⁰

Philip Rousseau in his review of Cain’s book⁷¹ notes that the *Historia* was certainly altered during its late antique transmission: “we can be sure that, once we get beyond Sozomen (so, the early 440s), Greek intermediate recollections were befogged by mounting opposition to Origen; and why copyists in later periods showed notable interest is in any case its own can of worms entirely”. Samuel Rubenson notes that modern editions of early monastic texts are mostly based upon mss that represent a late stage in a cumulative and living tradition. For example, in the mss of the *Apophthegmata Patrum*, “paragraphs were added and excluded, and ... the texts were constantly rearranged, reattributed, rephrased, divided and recombined”.⁷² Not only in collections of sayings, but also in the transmission of stories, letters and other sources, “each manuscript is a text of its own”.⁷³

In our *Dialogue*’s extant Greek, there are so many late, Byzantine words, elements deriving from translations from Latin, historical alterations, and long doctrinal cuts, that it is impossible to hypothesise that Rufinus translated the Greek as we have it now.

67) Bammel (above, note 65) 99; Ph. Luisier, Un fenomeno della Tarda Antichità: la nascita del monachesimo cristiano, *Chaos e Kosmos* 14 (2013) 4–5.

68) Cain, *Historia* (above, n. 64), esp. Chs 1–2.

69) Cain, *Historia* (above, n. 64) 259–65.

70) See Buchheit, *Rufinus als Fälscher* (above, n. 47).

71) Ph. Rousseau, *JTS* 68.2 (2017) 785–7, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jts/flx112>.

72) S. Rubenson, *Textual Fluidity in Early Monasticism: Sayings, Sermons and Stories*, in: L. Lied / H. Lundhaug (eds), *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions*, Berlin 2017, 178–200: 180.

73) *Ibid.* 190.

Much suggests that Rufinus' version (PG 40.1283) translated a 'Vorlage' closer to the original, known also to the Philocalists. Rufinus' version, indeed, proves more accurate than the extant Greek also in Evagrius' *Sententiae ad virginem*. Rufinus includes a longer version of Ad virginem 54, which in the extant Greek has been dropped, but is present in another, anonymous Latin version⁷⁴ and two early Syriac translations.⁷⁵ Therefore, Rufinus' translation "arguably is a better witness to Evagrius' original text than is the surviving Greek".⁷⁶ This, I suspect, is also the case with the *Dialogue of Adamantius*.

The transmission of the *Sentences of Sextus*, too, supports the hypothesis that Rufinus' translation of our *Dialogue* is faithful to the Greek 'Vorlage', whereas the extant Greek introduced alterations.⁷⁷ Before the discovery of the Greek original of the *Sentences* by Anton Elter in Codex Vaticanus Graecus 742, in 1880, it was thought that Rufinus altered his 'Vorlage' to christianise it. But the recovered original confirmed that Rufinus' translation was faithful and the Greek was already christianised. Similarly, with our *Dialogue*, it seems that Rufinus likely translated his 'Vorlage' faithfully, and subsequent alterations, cuts, and additions took place in the extant Greek.

Another parallel case, to some extent, is offered by the comparison between the Greek and Latin versions of the Council of Chalcedon (451): the ms. tradition has preserved a Greek version

74) A. Wilmart, Les versions latines des sentences d'Évagre pour les vierges, RBen 28 (1911) 143–53.

75) One was published by Frankenberg, the other is, to my knowledge, unpublished: ms. Vat. Syr. 126 fol. 250a.

76) A. Casiday, Reconstructing the Theology of Evagrius Ponticus, Cambridge 2013, 43.

77) On the *Sentences* as part of the body of philosophical asceticism dear to Origen and Rufinus see I. L. E. Ramelli, Social Justice and the Legitimacy of Slavery: The Role of Philosophical Asceticism from Ancient Judaism to Late Antiquity, Oxford 2016, 14–19 and passim, and the reviews by J. Glancy, IJCT (2017) 333–5; B. L. Ihssen, JTS 69.1 (2018) 318–20; D. Konstan, CW 111.2 (2018) 275–6; M. Tobon, CR 68.1 (2018) 126–8; G. Mandatori, Augustinianum 67 (2017) 264–70; J. van Oort, VigChr 72 (2018) 232; C. Rapp, JRS online 21 May 2018, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435818000412>; M. J. Stoutjesdijk, NTT JTSR 72 (2018) 253–4; Catherine Hezser, JR 99.3 (2019) 395–397; Hartmut Leppin, HistZ 308 (2019) 773–774.

of the Acts and three Latin translations from the sixth century.⁷⁸ As observed by Tommaso Mari, “the Latin translations are at times more reliable than the extant Greek version, not least because the Greek Acts underwent further revision after they were translated into Latin (probably in the seventh century)”.⁷⁹ This seems to have definitely been the case with the Greek extant text of the *Dialogue of Adamantius* as well, as I have endeavoured to show. Mari details: “In particular, if one looks at the content, the Latin Acts include materials that have been excised from the Greek Acts”.⁸⁰ This, on my argument, was also the case with the excision of passages, for example on apokatastasis, from the Greek of our *Dialogue*: they were arguably present in the ‘Vorlage’, but were dropped in the extant Greek, as suggested, mainly for doctrinal reasons.

Durham / Erfurt / Oxford / Detroit Ilaria Ramelli

78) Ed. E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum II Concilium universale Chalcedonense*, Berlin / Leipzig 1933–37, esp. Vol. II 1 with the Greek Acts, II 3 with the Latin Acts.

79) T. Mari, *The Latin Translations of the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, GRBS 58 (2018) 126–55, esp. 132–3. This observation is based mainly on R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, I–III*, Liverpool 2007, I 82–3; ACO II 1.1 VII–VIII and II 1.3 XXIX–XXX.

80) Mari (above, n. 79) 129.